

## **FINAL STAFF EVALUATION FOR ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST**

File No: SEP22-00001

### **I. SUMMARY OF PROPOSED ACTION**

The permanent stabilization project will remove temporary repair and then install bio-engineered streambank protection along approximately 130 feet of streambank along the west side of Issaquah Creek. Protection will include reconstruction of a portion of the bank lost to channel erosion in proximity to Issaquah School District infrastructure with an engineered, non-deformable log toe incorporating large woody debris and habitat boulders. Mechanical anchors are included in the design to add additional security for the large woody debris into the undisturbed streambank and channel, although habitat boulders will anchor the debris for normal and moderately high flow flood stages of the stream. As the bioengineered structure decays, revegetation within the reconstructed bank will take hold and form permanent, long-term stabilization.

### **II. GENERAL INFORMATION**

**Project Name:** Holly Street Permanent Creekbank Repair

**Applicant:** Janelle Walker, Capital Projects  
Issaquah School District  
5150 220<sup>th</sup> Avenue Southeast  
Issaquah, WA 98029

**Location:** 565 NW Holly Street; King County Parcel Number 2824069012

**Zoning:** Community Facilities – Facilities (CF-F)

**Comprehensive  
Plan Designation:** Community Facilities

The following information was considered as part of review of this application:

1. SEPA Environmental Checklist prepared November 3, 2021
2. Stream Study submitted November 9, 2021
3. Geo-technical Study submitted November 9, 2021

**NOTE:** Technical reports referenced above may not be attached to copies of this decision. Copies of exhibits, reports, attachments, or other documents may be reviewed and/or obtained by contacting the Community Planning and Development Department by telephone (425) 837-3100 or electronic mail [CPD@Issaquahwa.gov](mailto:CPD@Issaquahwa.gov).

### **III. BACKGROUND/PROPOSAL**

Remove the existing 497sf floating pier and four existing 12-inch diameter piles. Install a new 480sf fully grouted fixed pier and drive four 6-inch diameter piles and ten 8-inch diameter piles. Install one bottom based boatlift and re-install one bottom based jet ski lift. Remove existing concrete bulkhead approx. 93 feet. Remove existing concrete patio 330 square feet. Remove existing boat ramp 230 square feet. Install new rock bulkhead approximately 9 feet landward of existing concrete bulkhead. Install new beach cove & beach. Install native riparian vegetation approximately 791sf.

### **IV. REVIEW OF THE ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST**

The following lists the elements contained within the Environmental Checklist submitted for the proposed project. The numbers in the staff evaluation correspond to the numbers in the Environmental Checklist. If staff concurs with the applicant's response, this is so stated. If the response to a particular item in the checklist is found to be inadequate or clarification is needed, there is additional staff comment and evaluation.

#### **A. BACKGROUND**

**1:** Concur with checklist.

**2 – 5:** Concur with the checklist.

**6:** The applicant has submitted a land use permit application and a site work permit, which are currently under review by the Lead Agency. The proposed timing of construction indicated in the checklist may need to be revised.

**7:** Concur with the checklist.

**8:** Concur with checklist

**9:** Concur with the checklist.

**10:** A Shoreline Substantial Development Permit is being reviewed concurrent with the SEPA Environmental Checklist. Construction-related site work permit has been submitted to the City.

**11 – 12:** Concur with the checklist.

#### **B. ENVIRONMENTAL ELEMENTS**

1. Earth  
**a – h:** Concur with the checklist.

2. Air  
**a – c:** Concur with the checklist.

3. Water  
**a (1) – (6):** Concur with the checklist

- b (1) – (2):** Concur with the checklist.
- c (1) – (3):** Concur with the checklist.
- d:** Concur with the checklist.
4. Plants  
**a – e:** Concur with the checklist.
5. Animals  
**a – e:** Concur with the checklist.
6. Energy and Natural Resources  
**a – c:** Concur with the checklist.
7. Environmental Health  
**a (1) – (5):** Concur with the checklist.  
**b (1) – (3):** Concur with the checklist.
8. Land and Shoreline Use  
**a – m:** Concur with the checklist.
9. Housing  
**a – c:** Concur with the checklist.
10. Aesthetics  
**a – c:** Concur with the checklist.
11. Light and Glare  
**a – d:** Concur with the checklist.
12. Recreation  
**a– c:** Concur with the checklist.
13. Historic and Cultural Preservation  
**a – d:** Concur with the checklist.
14. Transportation:  
**a – h:** Concur with the checklist.
15. Public Services  
**a – b:** Concur with the checklist
16. Utilities  
**a – b:** Concur with the checklist.

#### **IV. PUBLIC COMMENTS**

Public notification was provided for this project. All residents within 300' of the proposal were notified. One public comment was received. The comment and responses from the applicant are included as Exhibit 1 in this report. Staff concurs with the applicant's responses except for the monitoring period. The City will monitor the site post construction per the US Army Corps of Engineers requirement of 10 years.

A Neighborhood Environmental Meeting was held on April 6, 2022. A Determination of Non-Significance (DNS) notification will be provided to residents within 300 feet of the project, publication in the local paper, and available on the City's website.

#### **VI. CONCLUSION**

The City of Issaquah has determined that this proposal will not have a probable significant adverse impact on the environment and pursuant to WAC 197-11-340(2) a (DNS) is issued for this project.

The DNS is based on impacts identified within the environmental checklist, attachments, and this Final Staff Evaluation for Application SEP22-00001, and is supported by plans, policies, and regulations formally adopted by City of Issaquah for the exercise of substantive authority under SEPA to approve, condition, or deny proposed actions.

---

**Douglas Yormick | Associate Environmental Planner**

May 6, 2022

**Date**

## Exhibit 1: Public Comment

### **Doug Yormick**

---

**From:** Walker, Janelle <WalkerJ2@issaquah.wednet.edu>  
**Sent:** Friday, April 8, 2022 8:49 AM  
**To:** Connie Marsh  
**Cc:** Doug Yormick; Tom Mullins  
**Subject:** ISD Holly Street Permanent Creek Bank Stabilization - Neighborhood Comments

Per your request at the April 6, 2022 neighborhood meeting for the Holly Street Permanent Creek Bank Stabilization below (in BLUE) are the responses your questions Doug sent us prior to the meeting.

Thank You

Janelle Walker  
Capital Projects  
Issaquah School District  
425-306-4022 – Cell  
425-837-7036 - Work

-----Original Message-----

From: Doug Yormick <DougY@issaquahwa.gov>  
Sent: Wednesday, April 6, 2022 11:26 AM  
To: Walker, Janelle <WalkerJ2@issaquah.wednet.edu>  
Subject: FW: Holly Street Stabilization

FYI on a comment that came in regarding Holly Streambank meeting. Please forward to your team and be prepared to provide a response.

Doug Yormick  
Associate Environmental Planner  
Community Planning and Development  
1775 12th Ave NW  
Issaquah, WA 98027  
425.837.3083  
doug@issaquahwa.gov

-----Original Message-----

From: Connie Marsh <auntgrumpy@comcast.net>  
Sent: Wednesday, March 30, 2022 6:42 PM  
To: Doug Yormick <DougY@issaquahwa.gov>  
Subject: Holly Street Stabilization

Hi Doug,

The studies for this stabilization do not follow our SMP requirement to use WDFW guidance for bank hardening. Instead they used a forest practices manual.

**ISD Response:** We used the forest practices board manual only to define the channel migration hazard zone since the City of Issaquah has not selected a preferred manual, so the State manual governs; the Integrated Streambank Protection Guidelines (WDFW, 2003) was in fact used to screen alternatives and develop stabilization recommendations, in accordance with the City's Shoreline Master Program (SMP).

Clearly the better answer is to remove the asphalt from the stream buffer and accommodate channel migration while working to minimize erosion.

**ISD Response:** We analyzed alternative approaches to bank stabilization including the 'no action' alternative. The concrete parking lot and subsurface utilities represent a public resource for which removal is not a preferred option.

The information indicates that a near term development proposal is forthcoming that would require the District get out of the buffer anyway.

**ISD Response:** The project team is not aware of a near-term development proposal; if this is in regards to the Holly Street Building adjacent to the parking lot, the building is currently permitted and under construction for the Early Learning Center Tenant Improvement. No further “redevelopment” of the property is proposed in the near future.

This project needs to be considered along with a redevelopment concept.

**ISD Response:** If this is in regards to the Holly Street Building adjacent to the parking lot, the building is currently permitted and under construction for the Early Learning Center Tenant Improvement. As part of the Early Learning Center TI a project to construction an associated playground is currently in design, but not in the vicinity of the creek bank repair. No further “redevelopment” of the property is proposed in the near future.

Hazardous trees are supposed to remain in the buffer per WDFW...as habitat etc. Creating snags and dropping the trees in place seems to be favored.

**ISD Response:** The plan utilizes the hazardous trees on the site within the carefully-constructed bank protection. Not only does this reduce cost, but it is compliant with programmatic requirements from FEMA and the Army Corps of Engineers. WDFW is aware of the design.

The chart has the coverage versus vegetative survival switched with what is in text. If this needs an HPA then one would expect a 10 year monitoring period.

**ISD Response:** WDFW will outline monitoring periods upon their final review of the project plans. We are monitoring the site regardless for 5 years per the City of Issaquah and 10 years per the Army Corps of Engineer’s requirements.

The SMP requires peer review.

**ISD Response:** The City of Issaquah will be issuing corrections for compliance with the SMP after their review of the project plans. Peer review is expected. The Critical Area Study report prepared by Wetland Resources was submitted with our Shoreline permit application and demonstrates compliance with the SMP and the mitigation plantings proposed.

I have linked the WDFW guidance below.

<https://wdfw.wa.gov/sites/default/files/publications/00046/wdfw00046.pdf>

**ISD Response:** The Geologist, Nelson Geotechnical Associates, maintains a physical copy of this guidance on-site whenever their representatives are present. The document was foundational to the recommendations of the geotechnical report and design of the project.

Thanks,

Connie Marsh